arXiv:0809.1689v1 [math.FA] 10 Sep 2008

NEW EXAMPLES OF c_0-SATURATED BANACH SPACES II

I. GASPARIS

Abstract. For every Banach space Z with a shrinking unconditional basis satisfying an upper p-estimate for some $p > 1$, an isomorphically polyhedral Banach space is constructed which has an unconditional basis and admits a quotient isomorphic to Z. It follows that reflexive Banach spaces with an unconditional basis and non-trivial type, Tsirelson's original space and $(\sum c_0)_{\ell_p}$ for $p \in (1, \infty)$, are isomorphic to quotients of isomorphically polyhedral Banach spaces with unconditional bases.

1. Introduction

An infinite-dimensional Banach space is c_0-saturated if every closed, linear, infinite-dimensional subspace contains a closed, linear subspace isomorphic to c_0. It is classical result [16] that every $C(K)$ space with K being a countable infinite, compact metric space, is c_0-saturated. This result was generalised in [8] to the class of the so-called Lindenstrauss-Phelps spaces, i.e., spaces whose dual closed unit ball has but countably many extreme points. These spaces in turn, belong to the class of the *isomorphically polyhedral* spaces. We recall that a Banach space is polyhedral if the closed unit ball of each of its finite-dimensional subspaces has finitely many extreme points. It is isomorphically polyhedral if it is polyhedral under an equivalent norm. It was proved in [9] that separable isomorphically polyhedral spaces are c_0-saturated.

Not much is known about the behavior of isomorphically polyhedral, or more generally c_0-saturated spaces, under quotient maps. It was asked in [17] if the dual of a separable isomorphically polyhedral space is ℓ_1-saturated that is, every closed, linear, infinite-dimensional subspace of the dual contains a further subspace isomorphic to ℓ_1. It is an open problem ([15], [17], [18]) if every quotient of a $C(K)$ space with K a countable and compact metric space, is c_0-saturated. It was shown in [10] that for every $p \in (1, \infty)$, ℓ_p is isomorphic to a quotient of an isomorphically polyhedral space with an unconditional basis. The purpose of this article is to extend this result by showing the following

Theorem 1.1. *Let Z be a Banach space with a shrinking, unconditional basis satisfying an upper p-estimate for some $p > 1$. Then, there exists an*

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* (2000) Primary: 46B03. Secondary: 06A07, 03E02.

Key words and phrases. c_0-saturated space, upper ℓ_p estimates, quotient map.

isomorphically polyhedral space with an unconditional basis which admits a quotient isomorphic to Z.

We obtain in particular, that reflexive spaces with unconditional bases and non-trivial type, are isomorphic to quotients of isomorphically polyhedral spaces with unconditional bases. The same property holds for $(\sum c_0)_{\ell_p}$, for all $p \in (1, \infty)$. Using the fact that Tsirelson's space T [7] is isomorphic to its modified version ([12], [5]), we also obtain that Tsirelson's original space T^* [19] is isomorphic to a quotient of an isomorphically polyhedral space with an unconditional basis.

A consequence of Theorem 1.1 is the existence of new examples of c_0-saturated spaces admitting reflexive quotients. The first example of such a space was given in [4], where a certain Orlicz function space was shown to admit ℓ_2 as a quotient. It was proved in [13] that ℓ_2 is a quotient of a c_0-saturated space with an unconditional basis.

More general results were obtained in [2] with the use of interpolation methods. They showed that every reflexive space with an unconditional basis has a block subspace which is isomorphic to a quotient of a c_0-saturated space. This result has been recently extended to cover all separable reflexive spaces. It is shown in [3] that every such space is a quotient of a c_0-saturated space with a basis.

2. Preliminaries

Our notation is standard as may be found in [14]. We shall consider Banach spaces over the real field. If X is a Banach space then B_X stands for its closed unit ball. A bounded subset B of the dual X^* of X is *norming*, if there exists $\rho > 0$ such that $\sup_{x^* \in B} |x^*(x)| \geq \rho \|x\|$, for all $x \in X$. In case $B \subset B_{X^*}$ and $\rho = 1$, B is said to isometrically norm X.

X is said to contain an *isomorph* of the Banach space Y (or, equivalently, that X contains Y isomorphically), if there exists a bounded linear injection from Y into X having closed range.

A sequence (x_n) in a Banach space is *semi-normalized* if $\inf_n \|x_n\| > 0$ and $\sup_n \|x_n\| < \infty$. It is called a *basic* sequence provided it is a Schauder basis for its closed linear span in X. A Schauder basis (x_n) for the space X is *shrinking*, if the sequence of functionals (x_n^*), biorthogonal to (x_n), is a Schauder basis for X^*.

If (x_n) and (y_n) are basic sequences, then (x_n) *dominates* (y_n) if there is a constant $C > 0$ so that $\| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i y_i \| \leq C \| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i \|$, for every choice of scalars $(a_i)_{i=1}^n$ and all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The basic sequences (x_n) and (y_n) are *equivalent*, if each one of them dominates the other. A basic sequence (x_n) is called *suppression* 1-unconditional, if $\| \sum_{i \in F} a_i x_i \| \leq \| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i \|$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, all choices of scalars $(a_i)_{i=1}^n$, and every $F \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$. Evidently, such a basic sequence is unconditional, that is every series of the form $\sum_n a_n x_n$ converges unconditionally, whenever it converges.

If (x_n) is a basic sequence in some Banach space X, then a sequence (u_n) of non-zero vectors in X, is a *block basis* of (x_n) if there exist a sequence of non-zero scalars (a_n) and a sequence (F_n) of sucessive finite subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ (i.e, $\max F_n < \min F_{n+1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$), so that $u_n = \sum_{i\in F_n} a_i x_i$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We then call F_n the *support* of u_n for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Any member of a block basis of (x_n) will be called a *block* of (x_n).

A Banach space with an unconditional basis (e_n) satisfies an *upper p-estimate*, for some $p > 1$, if there exists a constant $C > 0$ so that $\| \sum_{i=1}^n u_i\| \leq C(\sum_{i=1}^n \|u_i\|^p)^{1/p}$, for every choice $(u_i)_{i=1}^n$ of disjointly supported blocks of (e_n).

Given finite subsets E, F of $\mathbb{N}$, then the notation $E < F$ indicates that $\max E < \min F$. If μ, ν are finitely supported signed measures on $\mathbb{N}$, then we write $\mu < \nu$ if $\operatorname{supp}\mu < \operatorname{supp}\nu$.

A family $\mathcal{F}$ of finite subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ is said to be *compact* if it is compact in the topology of pointwise convergence in $2^{\mathbb{N}}$. We next recall the Schreier family

$$S_1 = \{F \subset \mathbb{N} : |F| \leq \min F\} \cup \{\emptyset\}.$$

The higher ordinal Schreier families $\{S_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1\}$, were introduced in [1] where it is shown that S_α is homeomorphic to the ordinal interval $[1, \omega^{\omega^\alpha}]$, for all $\alpha < \omega_1$.

3. THE MAIN CONSTRUCTION

Let Z be a Banach space with a normalized, shrinking, unconditional basis (z_n). By renorming if necessary, we may assume that $\| \sum_n a_n z_n\| = \| \sum_n |a_n| z_n\|$, for every $(a_n) \in c_{00}$. Define $\phi_Z \colon \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}$, by

$$\phi_Z(k) = \sup\Bigg\{\Bigg\|\sum_{i=1}^k u_i\Bigg\| : (u_i)_{i=1}^k \text{ are finitely and disjointly supported blocks of } (z_n),\ \|u_i\| \leq 1,\ \forall\, i \leq k\Bigg\},\ \forall\, k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

It is easy to see that ϕ_Z is a submultiplicative function, that is $\phi_Z(mn) \leq \phi_Z(m)\phi_Z(n)$ for all integers m, n. It follows from the results of [11] (cf. also Theorem 1.f.12 in [14]), that Z satisfies an upper p-estimate for some $p > 1$ if, and only if, $\phi_Z(k) < k$ for some $k \geq 2$. To define the desired isomorphically polyhedral space, we need to introduce some notations and definitions. Let Z satisfy an upper-p estimate for some $p > 1$. For simplicity, we shall write ϕ instead of ϕ_Z.

Notation. Fix some $k_0 \geq 2$ with $\phi(k_0) < k_0$ and choose $\lambda \in (\phi(k_0)/k_0, 1)$. Set $\epsilon_n = (1/k_0)^n$ and $\delta_n = \lambda^n$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$.

We next choose a sequence (F_n) of successive finite subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ (i.e., $\max F_n < \min F_{n+1}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$) so that $\sum_n (1/|F_n|) < 1$ and $1 + (1/\delta_n) < \epsilon_{n+1} \min F_{n+1}$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$.

Notation. Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let e_n^* denote the point mass measure at n. Let $\mathcal{P}$ denote the set of non-negative, finitely supported measures μ on $\mathbb{N}$ of the form $\mu = \sum_i \lambda_i e_{j_i}^*$, where $\lambda_i \in [0,1]$ and $j_i \in F_i$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let $\mathcal{P}_1 = \{\mu \in \mathcal{P} : \sum_i \mu(F_i) \leq 1\}$.

Definition 3.1. *A measure $\mu \in \mathcal{P}$ is said to be Z-bounded, provided that $\sum_i \mu(G_i) \leq 1$ for every sequence (G_i) of subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ with G_i an initial segment of F_i (we allow $G_i = \emptyset$) for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, such that $\|\sum_i (|G_i|/|F_i|) z_i\|_Z \leq 1$.*

Remark 3.2. *A typical example of a Z-bounded measure is as follows: Let (ρ_i) be a sequence of non-negative scalars such that $\|\sum_i \rho_i z_i^*\|_{Z^*} \leq 1$. For every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, choose an initial segment G_i of F_i. Let I be a finite subset of $\mathbb{N}$ and define $\mu = \sum_{i \in I} \rho_i (|G_i|/|F_i|) e^*_{\max G_i}$. Then μ is Z-bounded. Indeed, let (H_i) be a sequence of finite subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ with each H_i being an initial segment of F_i, such that $\|\sum_i (|H_i|/|F_i|) z_i\|_Z \leq 1$. Let $i \in I$. Then, either G_i is an initial segment of H_i, or, $\max G_i > \max H_i$. If the former, then $\mu(H_i) = \rho_i(|G_i|/|F_i|)$ and $|G_i|/|F_i| \leq |H_i|/|F_i|$. If the latter, then $\mu(H_i) = 0$. Let I_1 be the subset of I consisting of those elements of I for which the first alternative occurs. Then, $\|\sum_{i \in I_1} (|G_i|/|F_i|) z_i\|_Z \leq 1$, by our initial assumptions on (z_i), and so*

$$\sum_i \mu(H_i) = \sum_{i \in I_1} \mu(H_i) = \sum_{i \in I_1} \rho_i(|G_i|/|F_i|) \leq 1.$$

Definition 3.3. *A finite sequence $(\mu_i)_{i=1}^k$ of non-zero, disjointly supported members of $\mathcal{P}_1$ is called admissible, if for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have that $F_n \cap \operatorname{supp} \mu_i \neq \emptyset$ for at most one $i \leq k$, and, moreover, if $F_n \cap \operatorname{supp} \mu_i \neq \emptyset$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $i \leq k$, then $k \leq \min F_n$.*

Note in particular that $\{\min \operatorname{supp} \mu_i : i \leq k\} \in S_1$ if $(\mu_i)_{i=1}^k$ is admissible. We can now describe a norming subset of the space we wish to construct.

$$\mathcal{M} = \Big\{ \mu \in \mathcal{P}, \mu \text{ is } Z-\text{ bounded}, \mu = \sum_{i=1}^k \mu_i,\ k \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } (\mu_i)_{i=1}^k \text{ is an admissible sequence in } \mathcal{P}_1 \Big\} \cup \{e_n^* : n \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{0\}.$$

It is easy to see that $\mu | I \in \mathcal{M}$ for every $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$ and all $I \subset \mathbb{N}$. We can now define a norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{M}}$ on c_{00} by

$$\|x\|_{\mathcal{M}} = \max\Big\{ \Big| \sum_i \mu(\{i\}) x(i) \Big| : \mu \in \mathcal{M} \Big\}, \forall\, x \in c_{00}.$$

Let $X_{\mathcal{M}}$ be the completion of $(c_{00}, \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{M}})$. Since $\mathcal{M}$ is closed under restrictions to subsets of $\mathbb{N}$, we obtain that the natural basis (e_n) of c_{00} becomes a normalized, suppression 1-unconditional basis for $X_{\mathcal{M}}$. Note also that $\mathcal{M}$ is an isometrically norming subset of $B_{X^*_{\mathcal{M}}}$. Our objective is to show that $X_{\mathcal{M}}$ is isomorphically polyhedral and admits a quotient isomorphic to Z. The first task is accomplished through the next result, proved in [10] via Elton's theorem [6].

Proposition 3.4. *Let* X *be a Banach space with a normalized Schauder basis* (e_n). *Let* (e_n^*) *denote the sequence of functionals biorthogonal to* (e_n). *Assume there is a bounded norming subset* B *of* X^* *with the following property: There exists a compact family* $\mathcal{F}$ *of finite subsets of* $\mathbb{N}$ *such that for every* $b^* \in B$ *there exist* $F \in \mathcal{F}$ *and a finite sequence* $(b_k^*)_{k\in F}$ *of finitely supported absolutely sub-convex combinations of* (e_n^*) *so that* $b^* = \sum_{k\in F} b_k^*$ *and* $\min \operatorname{supp} b_k^* \geq k$ *for all* $k \in F$. *Then,* $\sum_n |b^*(e_n)| < \infty$, *for all* $b^* \in \overline{B}^{w^*}$ *and* X *is isomorphically polyhedral.*

Corollary 3.5. $X_{\mathcal{M}}$ *is isomorphically polyhedral and* (e_n) *is an unconditional, shrinking normalized basis for* $X_{\mathcal{M}}$.

Proof. The fact that (e_n) is normalized and unconditional follows directly from the definition of $\mathcal{M}$. Next, let $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$. We verify that the conditions given in Proposition 3.4 are fulfilled by μ with $\mathcal{F} = S_1$. Indeed, this is obvious when $\mu = e_n^*$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Otherwise, $\mu = \sum_{i=1}^k \mu_i$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and an admissible family $(\mu_i)_{i=1}^k$ of members of $\mathcal{P}_1$. Since every μ_i is a finitely supported sub-convex combination of (e_n^*), and $\{\min \operatorname{supp} \mu_i : i \leq k\} \in S_1$, the first assertion of the corollary follows from Proposition 3.4. Since $X_{\mathcal{M}}$ is c_0-saturated, it can not contain any isomorph of ℓ_1 and thus a classical result due to James yields that (e_n) is shrinking. ☐

In the sequel, we shall write $\|\cdot\|$, resp. $\|\cdot\|_*$, instead of $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{M}}$, resp. $\|\cdot\|_{X_{\mathcal{M}}^*}$.

The next lemma describes a simple method for selecting subsequences of (e_n), equivalent to the c_0-basis.

Lemma 3.6. *Let* I *be a finite subset of* $\mathbb{N}$ *and* $(G_n)_{n\in I}$ *a sequence of finite subsets of* $\mathbb{N}$ *with* G_n *an initial segment of* F_n *for all* $n \in I$, *such that* $\|\sum_{n\in I}(|G_n|/|F_n|)z_n\|_Z \leq 1$. *Then,* $\|\sum_{n\in I}\sum_{k\in G_n} e_k\| \leq 1$.

Proof. Set $u = \sum_{n\in I}\sum_{k\in G_n} e_k$. We show that $\mu(u) \leq 1$ for all $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$. In case $\mu = e_n^*$ for some $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then the assertion trivially holds. Every other element $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$ is Z-bounded and so $\mu(u) = \sum_{n\in I}\mu(G_n) \leq 1$, as $\|\sum_{n\in I}(|G_n|/|F_n|)z_n\|_Z \leq 1$. ☐

4. Z IS ISOMORPHIC TO A QUOTIENT OF $X_{\mathcal{M}}$

The main result of this section is the following

Theorem 4.1. *Let* $u_n^* = \sum_{i\in F_n}(1/|F_i|)e_i^*$, *for all* $n \in \mathbb{N}$. *Then* (u_n^*) *is equivalent to* (z_n^*), *the sequence of functionals biorthogonal to* (z_n).

The proof of this result will follow after a series of lemmas, where we first show that (u_n^*) dominates (z_n^*) and then that it is dominated by (z_n^*). Note that our initial assumptions on (z_n) yield that (z_n^*) is a normalized, suppression 1-unconditional basis for Z^*.

Lemma 4.2. *(u_n^*) dominates (z_n^*).*

Proof. Note first that (u_n^*) is a normalized (convex) block basis of (e_n^*) in $X_{\mathcal{M}}^*$. This is so since $\|\sum_{i\in F_n} e_i\| = 1$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ (observe that the support of every member of $\mathcal{M}$ meets each F_n in at most one point). We thus obtain that (u_n^*) is normalized and suppression 1-unconditional.

Now let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(a_i)_{i=1}^n$ be scalars in $[0,1]$ with $\|\sum_{i=1}^n a_i z_i^*\|_{Z^*} \leq 1$. We next find scalars $(b_i)_{i=1}^n$ in $[0,1]$ so that $\|\sum_{i=1}^n b_i z_i\|_Z \leq 1$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i b_i = \|\sum_{i=1}^n a_i z_i^*\|_{Z^*}$.

For each $i \leq n$ choose an initial segment G_i of F_i so that

$$|G_i|/|F_i| \leq b_i < (|G_i|/|F_i|) + (1/|F_i|).$$

This choice ensures, thanks to our initial assumptions on (z_n), that

$$\left\|\sum_{i=1}^n (|G_i|/|F_i|) z_i\right\|_Z \leq \left\|\sum_{i=1}^n b_i z_i\right\|_Z \leq 1.$$

Let $u = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k\in G_i} e_k$. We deduce from Lemma 3.6, that $\|u\| \leq 1$. It follows now that

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\sum_{i=1}^n a_i u_i^*\right\|_* &\geq \sum_{i=1}^n a_i u_i^*(u) = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \sum_{k\in F_i} (1/|F_i|) e_k^*(u) = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i (|G_i|/|F_i|) \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^n a_i (b_i - (1/|F_i|)) \geq \left\|\sum_{i=1}^n a_i z_i^*\right\|_{Z^*} - \sum_{i=1}^n (1/|F_i|).\end{aligned}$$

Next suppose that $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $(a_i)_{i=1}^n$ is a scalar sequence satisfying $\|\sum_{i=1}^n a_i z_i\|_{Z^*} = 1$. Let $I^+ = \{i \leq n : a_i \geq 0\}$ and $I^- = I \setminus I^+$. Our preceding work yields that

$$\left\|\sum_{i\in I^j} a_i u_i^*\right\|_* \geq \left\|\sum_{i\in I^j} a_i z_i^*\right\|_{Z^*} - \sum_{i\in I^j} (1/|F_i|), \forall\, j \in \{+,-\}.$$

We deduce now from the above and the fact that (u_n^*) is suppression 1-unconditional, that

$$2\left\|\sum_{i=1}^n a_i u_i^*\right\|_* \geq 1 - \sum_{i=1}^\infty (1/|F_i|) > 0.$$

Therefore, letting $A = (1/2)(1 - \sum_{i=1}^\infty (1/|F_i|)) > 0$, we obtain that

$$\left\|\sum_{i=1}^n a_i u_i^*\right\|_* \geq A \left\|\sum_{i=1}^n a_i z_i^*\right\|_{Z^*}$$

for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and all choices of scalars $(a_i)_{i=1}^n \subset \mathbb{R}$. The proof of the lemma is now complete. $\square$

Lemma 4.3. *Let $u = \sum_i a_i e_i$ be a finitely supported vector in $X_{\mathcal{M}}$, with $\|u\| \leq 1$ and $a_i \geq 0$, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\mu \in \mathcal{P}$ be Z-bounded and write $\mu = \sum_{i\in I} \lambda_i e_{j_i}^*$, where I is a finite subset of $\mathbb{N}$, $j_i \in F_i$ and $\lambda_i \in (0,1]$ for* *all* $i \in I$. *Suppose that there exists* $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ *with* $n < \min I$ *such that* $a_{j_i} \geq \epsilon_{n+1}$, *for all* $i \in I$. *Then,* $\|\mu\|_* \leq 2$.

Proof. Set $I_1 = \{i \in I : \lambda_i \geq 1/2\}$ and $I_2 = I \setminus I_1$. The assertion of the lemma will follow once we show that $\mu|I_s \in \mathcal{M}$ for every $s \leq 2$. To this end, we first claim that $|I_1| \leq 2/\epsilon_{n+1}$.

Indeed, if the claim were false, let $d = 2/\epsilon_{n+1}$ and choose $d+1$ elements $i_1 < \cdots < i_{d+1}$ in I_1. Since $d < \min F_i$, for all $i \in I$ (by the initial choice of the sequence (F_i)) we have that $(\lambda_s e^*_{j_{i_s}})_{s=1}^{d+1}$ is an admissible sequence of members of $\mathcal{P}_1$. Moreover, since μ is Z-bounded, so is $\mu|J$, for every $J \subset \mathbb{N}$. Therefore, $\sum_{s=1}^{d+1} \lambda_s e^*_{j_{i_s}} \in \mathcal{M}$ and so our assumptions on u yield that

$$1 \geq \|u\| \geq \sum_{s=1}^{d+1} \lambda_s e^*_{j_{i_s}}(u) = \sum_{s=1}^{d+1} \lambda_s a_{j_{i_s}} \geq (d+1)(\epsilon_{n+1}/2) > 1,$$

a contradiction that proves our claim. It follows now that $(\lambda_i e^*_{j_i})_{i \in I_1}$ is an admissible family and hence $\mu|I_1 \in \mathcal{M}$.

We next show that $\mu|I_2 \in \mathcal{M}$. We first choose a non-empty initial segment J_1 of I_2 which is maximal with respect to the condition $\sum_{i \in J_1} \lambda_i \leq 1$. In case $J_1 = I_2$, the assertion follows as $\mathcal{P}_1 \subset \mathcal{M}$.

If J_1 is a proper initial segment of I_2, then, by maximality, we must have

$$1/2 < \sum_{i \in J_1} \lambda_i \leq 1,$$

as $\lambda_i < 1/2$, for every $i \in I_2$. We now set $\mu_1 = \sum_{i \in J_1} \lambda_i e^*_{j_i}$. This measure belongs to $\mathcal{P}_1$ and satisfies $\mu_1(u) > \epsilon_{n+1}/2$ because $a_{j_i} \geq \epsilon_{n+1}$, for all $i \in I$.

We repeat the same process to $I_2 \setminus J_1$ and obtain a non-empty initial segment J_2 of $I_2 \setminus J_1$, and a measure $\mu_2 = \sum_{i \in J_2} \lambda_i e^*_{j_i}$ in $\mathcal{P}_1$ so that either $J_1 \cup J_2 = I_2$, or, J_2 is a proper initial segment of $I_2 \setminus J_1$ satisfying $\mu_2(u) > \epsilon_{n+1}/2$. If the former, the process stops. If the latter, the process continues. Because I_2 is finite, this process will terminate after a finite number of steps, say k. We shall then have produced successive subintervals $J_1 < \cdots < J_k$ of I_2 with $I_2 = \cup_{r=1}^k J_r$, and measures $\mu_1 < \cdots < \mu_k$ in $\mathcal{P}_1$ with $\mu_r = \sum_{i \in J_r} \lambda_i e^*_{j_i}$, for all $r \leq k$. Moreover, $\mu_r(u) > \epsilon_{n+1}/2$, for all $r < k$.

We claim that $k \leq d = 2/\epsilon_{n+1}$. Indeed, assuming the contrary, we have by the choice of k, that $\mu_r(u) \geq \epsilon_{n+1}/2$, for all $r \leq d$. But also, $2/\epsilon_{n+1} < \min F_i$, as $i \geq n+1$ for all $i \in I$, and thus, $(\mu_r)_{r=1}^d$ is admissible. Since $\nu = \sum_{r=1}^d \mu_r = \mu| \cup_{r=1}^d J_r$, it is Z-bounded and so $\nu \in \mathcal{M}$. Therefore,

$$1 \geq \|u\| \geq \sum_{r=1}^{d} \mu_r(u) > d\epsilon_{n+1}/2 = 1,$$

which is a contradiction. Hence, $k \leq 2/\epsilon_{n+1} \leq \min F_i$, for all $i \in I$. This implies that $(\mu_r)_{r=1}^k$ is admissible and so $\mu|I_2 = \sum_{r=1}^k \mu_r \in \mathcal{M}$, completing the proof of the lemma. □

Lemma 4.4. *Let* $u = \sum_i a_i e_i$ *be a finitely supported vector in* $X_{\mathcal{M}}$*, with* $\|u\| \leq 1$ *and* $a_i \geq 0$*, for all* $i \in \mathbb{N}$*. Let* I *be a finite subset of* $\mathbb{N}$ *and* $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ *with* $n < \min I$*. Suppose that for each* $i \in I$ *there exists an initial segment* G_i *of* F_i *such that* $a_{\max G_i} \geq \epsilon_{n+1}$*. Let* (ρ_i) *be a sequence of non-negative scalars such that* $\| \sum_i \rho_i z_i^* \|_{Z^*} \leq 1$*. Assume further that there exists a family* $\mathcal{J}$ *of pairwise disjoint subsets of* I *such that every member* J *of* $\mathcal{J}$ *satisfies the following conditions:* (1) $\| \sum_{i \in J} (|G_i|/|F_i|) z_i \|_Z \leq 1$*, and* (2) $\sum_{i \in J} \rho_i (|G_i|/|F_i|) \geq \delta_n$*. Then,* $|\mathcal{J}| < (1/\epsilon_{n+1})(1 + [1/\delta_n])$ *and,*

$$\sum_{J \in \mathcal{J}} \sum_{i \in J} \rho_i (|G_i|/|F_i|) \leq (1 + 1/\delta_n) \phi(k_0)^{n+1}.$$

Proof. We set $d = (1/\epsilon_{n+1})(1 + [1/\delta_n])$ and assume, to the contrary, that $|\mathcal{J}| \geq d$. We can now select pairwise disjoint members $J_1, \dots, J_d$ of $\mathcal{J}$ and define $\mu_r = \sum_{i \in J_r} \rho_i (|G_i|/|F_i|) e^*_{\max G_i}$, for all $r \leq d$. Since $\| \sum_i \rho_i z_i^* \|_{Z^*} \leq 1$, (1) implies that $\mu_r \in \mathcal{P}_1$ for all $r \leq d$. But also, $n + 1 \leq i$, for all $i \in I$ and thus, $d < \min F_i$ for all $i \in I$, because of our initial assumptions on (F_i). It follows now that $(\mu_r)_{r=1}^d$ is admissible. Let $\mu = \sum_{r=1}^d \mu_r$. Since μ is Z-bounded (see Remark 3.2), we infer from the above that $\mu \in \mathcal{M}$ and therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 \geq \mu(u) &= \sum_{r=1}^d \sum_{i \in J_r} \rho_i (|G_i|/|F_i|) a_{\max G_i} \\ &\geq \sum_{r=1}^d \sum_{i \in J_r} \rho_i (|G_i|/|F_i|) \epsilon_{n+1} \geq \epsilon_{n+1} \delta_n d, \text{ by (2).} \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $d \leq 1/(\epsilon_{n+1}\delta_n) < (1/\epsilon_{n+1})(1 + [1/\delta_n]) = d$. This contradiction shows that $|\mathcal{J}| < d$, as required.

We next verify the second assertion of the lemma. To this end,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{J \in \mathcal{J}} \sum_{i \in J} \rho_i (|G_i|/|F_i|) &= \Big(\sum_i \rho_i z_i^* \Big) \Big(\sum_{J \in \mathcal{J}} \sum_{i \in J} (|G_i|/|F_i|) z_i \Big) \\ &\leq \Big\| \sum_{J \in \mathcal{J}} \sum_{i \in J} (|G_i|/|F_i|) z_i \Big\|_Z \leq \phi(|\mathcal{J}|), \text{ by (1),} \\ &\leq \phi\big((1/\epsilon_{n+1})(1 + [1/\delta_n]) \big) \leq \phi(1/\epsilon_{n+1}) \phi(1 + [1/\delta_n]), \\ &\text{by the submultiplicativity of } \phi, \\ &\leq (1 + 1/\delta_n) \phi(k_0^{n+1}) \leq (1 + 1/\delta_n) \phi(k_0)^{n+1}, \end{aligned}$$

using once again the fact that ϕ is submultiplicative. This concludes the proof of the lemma. □

Lemma 4.5. *There exists a constant* $C > 0$ *such that for every* $I \subset \mathbb{N}$*, finite, and every collection of scalars* $(\rho_i)_{i \in I}$ *with* $\| \sum_i \rho_i z_i^* \|_{Z^*} \leq 1$*, we have that* $\| \sum_{i \in I} \rho_i u_i^* \|_* \leq C$*. Consequently,* (z_i^*) *dominates* (u_i^*)*.*

Proof. The unconditionality of (z_i^*) clearly allows us establish the assertion of the lemma under the additional assumption that $\rho_i \geq 0$, for all $i \in I$. Given $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, let $I_n = \{i \in I : i > n\}$. Let $u = \sum_i a_i e_i$ be a finitely supported vector in $X_{\mathcal{M}}$, with $\|u\| \leq 1$ and $a_i \geq 0$, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. We have the following initial estimate

$$
\begin{aligned}
(4.1)\qquad \sum_{i\in I} \rho_i u_i^*(u) &= \sum_{i\in I} \rho_i \sum_{j\in F_i} a_j/|F_i| = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{i\in I} \rho_i \sum_{j\in F_i:\, a_j\in(\epsilon_{n+1},\epsilon_n]} a_j/|F_i| \\
&\leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n\epsilon_n + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{i\in I_n} \rho_i \sum_{j\in F_i:\, a_j\in(\epsilon_{n+1},\epsilon_n]} a_j/|F_i|.
\end{aligned}
$$

Fix some $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. For each $i \in I_n$, let j_i^n denote the largest $j \in F_i$ so that $a_j \in (\epsilon_{n+1}, \epsilon_n]$. In case j_i^n fails to exist, then the corresponding summand in (4.1) equals 0 and thus it has no effect into our estimates. Let G_i^n be the initial segment of F_i with $\max G_i^n = j_i^n$. It is clear that

$$
(4.2)\qquad \sum_{j\in F_i:\, a_j\in(\epsilon_{n+1},\epsilon_n]} a_j/|F_i| \leq (\epsilon_n/\epsilon_{n+1}) a_{j_i^n}(|G_i^n|/|F_i|),\ \forall\, i \in I_n.
$$

Call a subset J of I_n bad, if

$$
\Big\|\sum_{i\in J}(|G_i^n|/|F_i|)z_i\Big\|_Z \leq 1, \text{ and } \sum_{i\in J}\rho_i(|G_i^n|/|F_i|) \geq \delta_n.
$$

It is clear that we can extract a maximal, under inclusion, family $\mathcal{J}_n$ consisting of pairwise disjoint, bad subsets of I_n. We now observe the following: If $J \subset I_n \setminus \cup\mathcal{J}_n$ and $\| \sum_{i\in J}(|G_i^n|/|F_i|)z_i\Big\|_Z \leq 1$, then $\sum_{i\in J} \rho_i(|G_i^n|/|F_i|) < \delta_n$. Indeed, if that were not so, then J would be bad, contradicting the maximality of $\mathcal{J}_n$.

Letting $\mu_n = \sum_{i\in I_n\setminus\cup\mathcal{J}_n} \rho_i(|G_i^n|/|F_i|)e^*_{j_i^n}$, we infer from the preceding observation, that $(1/\delta_n)\mu_n$ is a Z-bounded measure. On the other hand, $a_{j_i^n} \geq \epsilon_{n+1}$, for each $i \in I_n$ for which j_i^n exists, and therefore Lemma 4.3 yields that $\|\mu_n\|_* \leq 2\delta_n$. Taking in account (4.2), we obtain the estimate

(4.3)

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i\in I_n\setminus\cup\mathcal{J}_n} \rho_i \sum_{j\in F_i:\, a_j\in(\epsilon_{n+1},\epsilon_n]} a_j/|F_i| &\leq (\epsilon_n/\epsilon_{n+1}) \sum_{i\in I_n\setminus\cup\mathcal{J}_n} \rho_i a_{j_i^n}(|G_i^n|/|F_i|) \\
&= (\epsilon_n/\epsilon_{n+1})\mu_n(u) \leq 2k_0\delta_n.
\end{aligned}
$$

We next employ Lemma 4.4 to obtain the estimate

$$
(4.4)\qquad \sum_{J\in\mathcal{J}_n} \sum_{i\in J} \rho_i(|G_i^n|/|F_i|) \leq (1 + 1/\delta_n)\phi(k_0)^{n+1}
$$

and thus, taking (4.2) into account, we reach the estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{i\in\cup\mathcal{J}_n}\rho_i\sum_{j\in F_i\colon a_j\in(\epsilon_{n+1},\epsilon_n]}a_j/|F_i| \\
&\le(\epsilon_n/\epsilon_{n+1})\sum_{i\in\cup\mathcal{J}_n}\rho_i a_{j_i^n}(|G_i^n|/|F_i|)=k_0\sum_{J\in\mathcal{J}_n}\sum_{i\in J}\rho_i a_{j_i^n}(|G_i^n|/|F_i|) \\
&\le k_0\epsilon_n\sum_{J\in\mathcal{J}_n}\sum_{i\in J}\rho_i(|G_i^n|/|F_i|)\le k_0\epsilon_n(1+1/\delta_n)\phi(k_0)^{n+1},\ \text{by (4.4)}, \\
&=k_0\phi(k_0)(1+1/\delta_n)(\phi(k_0)/k_0)^n=k_0\phi(k_0)[(\phi(k_0)/k_0)^n+(\phi(k_0)/\lambda k_0)^n].
\end{aligned}\tag{4.5}$$

Let $B_n = k_0\phi(k_0)[(\phi(k_0)/k_0)^n + (\phi(k_0)/\lambda k_0)^n]$. Equations (4.3) and (4.5) now yield that

$$\sum_{i\in I_n}\rho_i\sum_{j\in F_i\colon a_j\in(\epsilon_{n+1},\epsilon_n]}a_j/|F_i|\le 2k_0\delta_n+B_n,\ \forall\, n\ge 0,$$

and so, finally, (4.1) gives us the estimate

$$\sum_{i\in I}\rho_i u_i^*(u)\le\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(n\epsilon_n+2k_0\delta_n+B_n)<\infty,$$

as $0 < \phi(k_0)/k_0 < \lambda < 1$. The assertion of the lemma now follows as (e_n) is an unconditional basis for $X_{\mathcal{M}}$. □

Proof of Theorem 4.1. It follows directly from Lemmas 4.2 and 4.5 that (u_n^*) and (z_n^*) are equivalent. □

Corollary 4.6. *Z is isomorphic to a quotient of $X_{\mathcal{M}}$ and the map $Q\colon X_{\mathcal{M}} \to Z$ given by*

$$Q\Big(\sum_n a_n e_n\Big)=\sum_n\Big(\sum_{k\in F_n}a_k/|F_n|\Big)z_n$$

is a well-defined, bounded, linear surjection.

Proof. Since (z_n^*) dominates (u_n^*), we have that Q is a well-defined, bounded, linear operator. It is easy to see now, that $Q^*(z_n^*) = u_n^*$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and thus Q^* is an isomorphic embedding of Z^* into $X_{\mathcal{M}}^*$, by Theorem 4.1. It follows now that Q is a surjection. □

REFERENCES

[1] D. Alspach and S. A. Argyros, *Complexity of weakly null sequences*, Dissertationes Math., **321** (1992), 1–44.

[2] S. A. Argyros and V. Felouzis, *Interpolating Hereditarily Indecomposable Banach spaces*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **13** (2000), 243–294.

[3] S. A. Argyros and T. Raikoftsalis, *The cofinal property of indecomposable reflexive Banach spaces*, preprint.

[4] P. G. Casazza, N. J. Kalton and L. Tzafriri, *Decompositions of Banach lattices into direct sums*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **304** (1987), 771–800.

[5] P. G. Casazza and E. Odell, *Tsirelson's space and minimal subspaces*, Texas functional analysis seminar 1982-83 (Austin, TX), 61–72, Longhorn Notes, University Texas press, Austin, TX, 1983.

[6] J. Elton, *Extremely weakly unconditionally convergent series*, Israel J. Math. **40** (1981), 255–258.

[7] T. Figiel and W. B. Johnson, *A uniformly convex Banach space which contains no* ℓ_p, Compositio Math. **29** (1974), 179–190.

[8] V. Fonf, *A property of Lindenstrauss-Phelps spaces*, Functional Anal. Appl. **13** (1979), no.1, 66–67.

[9] V. Fonf, *Polyhedral Banach spaces*, Mat. Zametki **30** (1981), no. 4, 627–634.

[10] I. Gasparis, *New examples of* c_0*-saturated Banach spaces*, preprint.

[11] W. B. Johnson, *On finite dimensional subspaces of Banach spaces with local unconditional structure*, Studia Math. **51** (1974), 223–238.

[12] W. B. Johnson, *A reflexive Banach space which is not sufficiently Euclidean*, Studia Math. **55** (1976), 201–205.

[13] D.H. Leung, *On* c_0*-saturated Banach spaces*, Illinois J. Math. **39** (1995), 15–29.

[14] J. Lindenstrauss and L. Tzafriri, *Classical Banach spaces I, II*, Springer-Verlag, New York (1977).

[15] E. Odell, *On quotients of Banach spaces having shrinking unconditional bases*, Illinois J. Math. **36** (1992), 681–695.

[16] A. Pelczynski and Z. Semadeni, *Spaces of continuous functions III. Spaces* $C(\Omega)$ *for* Ω *without perfect subsets*, Studia Math. **18** (1959), 211–222.

[17] H. P. Rosenthal, *Some aspects of the subspace structure of infinite-dimensional Banach spaces*, Approximation theory and functional analysis (College Station, 1990), 151–176, Academic Press 1991.

[18] H. P. Rosenthal, *The Banach spaces* $C(K)$, Handbook of the geometry of Banach spaces, Vol.2, (W. B. Johnson and J. Lindenstrauss eds.), North Holland (2003), 1547–1602.

[19] B. S. Tsirelson, *Not every Banach spaces contains* ℓ_p *or* c_0, Funct. Anal. Appl. **8** (1974), 138–141.

Department of Mathematics, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki 54124, Greece.

E-mail address: `ioagaspa@math.auth.gr`